

REMARKS

As a preliminary matter, Applicants filed an Information Disclosure Statement on July 12, 2005, which contains some inadvertent errors. The references were cited in a communication issued by the United Kingdom, and they were cited in a foreign counterpart to a divisional of the present application. Also, European Patent Application 802614 was known to Applicants or Applicants' attorney, more than three months prior to the filing of the Information Disclosure Statement.

Claims 1-14 and 17-21 stand rejected on the basis of Soultanian '092, alone or in combination with other references. Applicants have amended the independent claims to better define the invention, and respectfully traverse for the reasons previously given. To avoid repetition, Applicants will only address the Examiner's Response to Arguments in this paper.

The Examiner's dictionary definition of "interlocking" is inapposite, because in the present invention the moving and stationary laminations themselves are interlocked, and in Soultanian '092, the laminations themselves are not interlocked (i.e., united, joined (closely or otherwise) or connected together) due to the presence of the spacing member 48, which maintains a space between the stator 10 and the armature 12. Applicants' laminations are interlocked by the Examiner's definition, but Soultanian's are not.

The Examiner repeats his reference to page 8, line 6 of the specification, which states that "hinging can be accomplished in many ways". While hinging in accordance with the claim language could be accomplished by wrapping the stationary laminations around the

moving laminations, or wrapping the moving laminations around the stationary laminations, the hinging must be accomplished by interlocking the moving and stationary laminations, as clearly recited in the claims. In any event, no matter how “closely” the moving piece laminations are joined to the stationary laminations in Soultanian ‘092 by the spacer 48, the laminations themselves are clearly not interlocked to form a hinge.

In response to the Examiner’s comment regarding “directly”, directly has been deleted from the independent claims, and replaced with language which more clearly defines that the hinge is formed by the moving piece laminations and stationary piece laminations.

The Stettler ‘905 patent was addressed in Amendment D, mailed June 17, 2004.

The disclosed hinge system for a trim flap on a boat is clearly not analogous art.

Applicants believe that the claims now more clearly define that the moving and stationary laminations themselves are interlocked to form a hinge. Accordingly, withdrawal of the outstanding rejections based on Soultanian is respectfully requested.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants believe that his case is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The Examiner should call Applicants' attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By



Patrick G. Burns
Registration No. 29,367

August 30, 2005

300 South Wacker Drive
Suite 2500
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: 312.360.0080
Facsimile: 312.360.9315

Customer No. 24978
P:\DOCS\2206\64630\9F6304.DOC